

OFFOR APPELLATE COURT

IN THE SUPREME COURT FOR THE STATE OF ALASKA THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT AT ANCHORAGE 2020 AUG 10 AM II: 29

BY. DEPUTY CLERK REFUSED FOR FILING
A strategy by the strategy of
The court has issued its opinion in these
its opinion in these appeals, and the cases on #8-1777 evidence or claims must
on #8-1777 evidence or dams must
first be presented to a trial court for relief.
m. monte onere

ADDITION TO 60B

Loren Rancourt, Appellant, hereby notifies the court: another legal team has been added to Rancourts defense for tort remedy. This notice is filed out of personal conviction to avoid litigation (with implicated Honorable dedendants).

After filing a 60(b) motion to examine intentional paternity fraud, a teleconference was held, with a legal team for the manufacturer of an at home dna test. Which, was used to establish paternity (at trial). The manufacturer was responding to Rancourts consumer complaint.

The dna test kit at issue, sold across the nation (in major pharmacies), has a disclosure on the box. Which states: the companies product is <u>not</u> to be used in court.

Loren R. v Sharnel V. Opinion #: S-1777 Addition to 60(b) Pg 1 of 2

Which is consistent with the industry standard (across the board) for at home DNA test

kits.

The test is being used in Alaskan courts as evidence of paternity, in Loren R. v

Sharnel V. Which, relied on unqualified oral findings, of a poorly handled at home test

kit. As the basis for a life changing paternity determination. In violation of the law.

Relying on a petitioners testimony (after ample time for DNA manipulation).

Which, recently disclosed to Rancourt, is the basis for a paternity determination. Likely

not the "catch all" best interest factors, (as the Supreme Court so erroneously published in

S-1777).

The manufacturer, with international business rapport, agreed to support a

consumer. The team concluded: it is in the companies best interest to prevent their

product from being used in sham court proceedings. They intend legal action consistent

with a consumers right to privacy, when using a sensitive product. Rancourt hereby

notifies the court of an opportunity to prevent tax payer burden.

Respectfully submitted this 101 day of August, 2020,

Loren Rancourt

5432 E Northern Lights #405

Anchorage, AK, 99508

(907)268-7670

(Opposing party: non-opposition)

Loren R. v Sharnel V.

Opinion #: S-1777

Addition to 60(b)